REMARKS

As a result of the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jungerman '340) in view of Soma '321. Independent claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 have been amended.

Rejection of Claims 1-10 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jungerman '340 in view of Soma '321. Independent claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 have been amended to better define the invention.

Applicants' claimed invention does not measure the variation of the period of an input signal, nor measure the density of the frequency domain data to derive an indication of absolute jitter, as do Jungerman '340 and Soma 321.

Applicants' claimed invention generates a virtual ideal reference clock and then compares the edges of this virtual ideal reference clock with edges of an input signal (e.g., an external clock or external data signal) to measure the relative jitter between the two.

An important feature of the subject invention is that it stores and manipulates only the edge data of the signal, filtering only the edge data to generate the virtual ideal reference clock. Neither Jungerman '340 nor Soma '321 filters the edge data. Consequently, neither Jungerman nor Soma can generate a virtual ideal reference clock in this way, and therefore cannot compare the virtual ideal reference clock with an input signal.

The subject invention acquires the signal, converts it to the frequency domain, then filters the edge data of the signal by multiplying the frequency domain frequency domain data by respective predetermined coefficients in different frequency domains. The resulting filtered frequency domain data is then converted back to the time domain to obtain the edges for the recovered clock signal. The time domain edge data for the recovered clock signal is compared with the time domain edge data for the external clock to measure the jitter of the external clock relative to the recovered clock signal. As noted above neither Jungerman '340 nor Soma '321

filters the edge data.

Thus, the combination of Jungerman '340 and Soma '321 does not and cannot show or suggest

> "converting said detected time domain data of said edges of said external clock into frequency domain data;
> filtering said frequency domain data by multiplying said frequency domain data by respective predetermined coefficients in different frequency domains;"

as called for in amended independent claim 1 and in similar language in amended independent claims 3, 5, and 7.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that grounds for the final rejection have been overcome, respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn and urges the allowance of claims 1-10.

Respectfully submitted,

KATSUHIRO WATANABE, ET AL.

By /Thomas F. Lenihan Reg. No. 32152/

Thomas F. Lenihan, Reg. No. 32,152
Attorney for Applicant

TEKTRONIX, INC.
Thomas F. Lenihan
P.O. Box 500 (50-LAW)
Beaverton, OR 97077
(503) 627-7266

Attorney's Docket No.: 7651-US0 16 January 2009